

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

KAMAL KARNA ROY,

Plaintiff,

vs.

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN IN
USA AND LORD, ET AL,

Defendants.

NO. CV-09-0204-LRS

ORDER OF DISMISSAL

The *pro se* plaintiff, Kamal Karna Roy, has filed a *pro se* complaint dated July 6, 2009. Under 28 U.S.C. §1915, district courts are required to screen *pro se* complaints for legal and factual sufficiency. On August 24, 2009, the Court conducted the required screening. Fed.R.Civ.P. 8(a) requires a complaint to contain a short and plain statement of the grounds upon which the court's jurisdiction depends, a short and plain statement of the claim showing the pleader is entitled to relief, and a demand for judgment for the relief the pleader seeks. Rule 8(e)(1) requires averment of a pleading be simple, concise and direct.

The Court determines that Plaintiff's Complaint fails to comply with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a) and fails to state a claim(s) for which federal jurisdiction lies. When a complaint is dismissed

1 under section 1915(e), the plaintiff should be given leave to amend
2 the complaint with directions as to curing its deficiencies, unless it
3 is clear from the face of the complaint that the deficiencies could
4 not be cured by amendment. *Noll v. Carlson*, 809 F.2d 1446, 1448 (9th
5 Cir.1987) (dismissal for failure to state a claim). The Court finds
6 that the deficiencies herein cannot be cured by amendment. The Court
7 hereby dismisses Plaintiff's action without prejudice.

8 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:** Plaintiff's action is **DISMISSED** without
9 prejudice.

10 **IT IS SO ORDERED.** The District Court Executive is directed to
11 enter this Order, enter judgment as appropriate, provide a copy to
12 plaintiff, and **CLOSE THIS FILE**.

13 **DATED** this 3rd day of September, 2009.

14
15 ***s/Lonny R. Suko***

16 _____
LONNY R. SUKO
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE